

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

LATHAM & WATKINS

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
NEW JERSEY OFFICE

PAUL R. WATKINS (1899-1973)
DANA LATHAM (1898-1974)

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W., SUITE 1300
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2505
TELEPHONE (202) 637-2200
FAX (202) 637-2201
TLX 590775
ELN 62793269

ONE NEWARK CENTER
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07101-3174
TELEPHONE (201) 639-1234
FAX (201) 639-7298

NEW YORK OFFICE
885 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1000
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-4802
TELEPHONE (212) 906-1200
FAX (212) 751-4864

ORANGE COUNTY OFFICE
850 TOWN CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 2000
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626-1925
TELEPHONE (714) 540-1235
FAX (714) 755-8290

SAN DIEGO OFFICE
701 "B" STREET, SUITE 2100
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-8197
TELEPHONE (619) 236-1234
FAX (619) 696-7419

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1900
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-2562
TELEPHONE (415) 391-0600
FAX (415) 395-8095

CHICAGO OFFICE

SEARS TOWER, SUITE 5800
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 876-7700
FAX (312) 993-9767

LONDON OFFICE

ONE ANGEL COURT
LONDON EC2R 7HJ ENGLAND
TELEPHONE + 44-171-374 4444
FAX + 44-171-374 4460

LOS ANGELES OFFICE

633 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 4000
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071-2007
TELEPHONE (213) 485-1234
FAX (213) 891-8763

MOSCOW OFFICE

113/1 LENINSKY PROSPECT, SUITE C200
MOSCOW 117198 RUSSIA
TELEPHONE + 7-503 956-5555
FAX + 7-503 956-5556

February 26, 1996

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 92-297, RM-7872, RM-7722
Ex Parte Presentation

Dear Mr. Caton:

Edward J. Fitzpatrick of Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc. and the undersigned representative of Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc. met on February 22, 1996 with Commission representatives Rudolfo M. Baca, David Wye and Jackie Chorney to discuss band segmentation proposals for the 28 GHz band. The enclosed materials formed the basis for those discussions.

An original and two copies of this letter are enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. Janka

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

022

28 GHz BAND PLAN OPTIONS

Proceeding Overview

GSO FSS is an established service

- **28 GHz is the next growth band**

GSO FSS 28 GHz spectrum requirements in the US have remained constant (1000 MHz)

Other services have expanded their stated needs

- **LMDS now requires separated return links**
- **LMDS has reneged on Neg Reg sharing agreement**
- **Iridium has expanded from 100 to 200 MHz**
- **Odyssey has expanded from 100 to 300 MHz**
- **Teledesic has expanded from 400 to 500 MHz (standard terminals)**

Option 4 Is Inequitable

GSOs have solved the NGSO MSS sharing issue

**Option 4 spectrum reduction places burden of LMDS
return link problem on GSOs**

- **Lost capacity**
- **Smaller market**
- **System redesign**
- **Lost market opportunity from schedule delay**
- **Increased system cost**

**Inadequate bandwidth jeopardizes viability of mass
market 28 GHz GSO FSS in the US**

Option 4 Is Inequitable

GSOs have been asked to bear numerous burdens under any band plan

- **constraints from sharing with NGSO MSS feeder links**
 - performance and capacity losses
 - design limitations (current and future systems)
- **non-standard downlink pairing**
- **non-contiguous spectrum**
- **LMDS grandfathering**
- **restrictive space science power limits**

GSOs have most extensive sharing

- **with each other (2 degree spacing)**
- **with NGSO MSS feeder links**

Other Alternatives Must Be Pursued



Original Band Plan (NPRM July 1995) is acceptable with minor adjustments

- **Hughes/TRW sharing principles resolve issue in 250 MHz of shared spectrum**
- **GSOs and Iridium must avoid spectrum overlap**

Options 1, 2, 2A, 2B and 5 are viable

Options 3 and 4 are unacceptable

- **significant GSO bandwidth constraints**

Some adjustments by other services may be required

Extraterritorial Extension



Hughes supports “market solution” to international 28 GHz issues

Restricting US GSO operations in 400 MHz internationally biases market access in favor of NGSO

Regulations should not shackle GSO FSS to advantage of NGSO FSS

- **reciprocal treatment required**
- **flexibility needed to respond to future changes in band usage**

Band plan should be only a domestic solution

Summary

GSOs have agreed to numerous concessions in order to develop a compromise band plan

GSO spectrum needs have remained constant while other services have expanded their needs

GSOs should not be asked to bear additional pain to solve the LMDS return link problem

Options 3 and 4 are “non-starters” for GSOs in the US

Option 5 is the best solution in the US for all parties

- **provides requested amount of spectrum to all services**
- **only a minor adjustment to July 1995 NPRM proposal**
- **LMDS burden is less than GSOs have been asked to bear**
- **most consistent with WRC-95**